

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/674,774

Applicant(s)

NEIL ET AL.

Examiner

Carlos Lopez

Art Unit

1731

## All Participants:

(1) Carlos Lopez

(2) Robert Clark

## Status of Application: Pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 11 January 2005

Time: 2pm

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

23,25,27,28, and 30-31

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

## Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant agreed to amend claims 23,25,27,28, and 30-31 to read that the assembly being sintered and heated is an arc tube assembly formed by the insertion of an end cap of a capillary tube into an open end of a hollow arc tube. Previously, the claims did not clearly note that the assembly being sintered and heated was an assembly formed in step b of claims 23 and 28 of the instant application. Instead, the originally filed claims noted that the transient assembly button was the assembly being heated and sintered. .